

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2, and 9 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 and 5-20 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5, AND 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MCLANE, SR. (US 5,163,359)

The present invention as recited in claim 1 (as amended herein), relates to a cooking apparatus comprising "a heat blocking member integrally extending from a reflecting member of the heating unit, to extend below a predetermined portion of the grill unit to reflect and block a part of the thermal energy transmitted to an edge of the grill unit" (emphasis added).

McLane teaches a cooking apparatus, which comprises a grill 56, two burners 124, brackets 130, and slats 126 positioned at an angle to direct heated air flow (see column 3, lines 52-60). McLane also teaches a drip ledge 136 between the burners 124 and the grill 56 to channel grease to a sump 100 and away from the burners 124 (see Abstract).

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts, "[McLane] clearly shows a heat blocking member (136) which is vertically inwardly directed with respect to outer edge portions of grill (56) and therefore would block a part of the thermal energy transmitted to those edge portion of the grill unit."

However, nothing in the McLane reference teaches or suggests that the drip ledge 136 is provided to block a part of the thermal energy transmitted to the edge portions of the grill unit. Instead, McLane clearly teaches that the drip ledge 136 is provided to channel grease to the sump 100 and away from the burners.

Further, the drip ledge 136 of McLane is not connected to the bracket 130 (see Fig. 2). To this end, the drip ledge 136 does not integrally extend from the bracket 130. According, McLane does not teach or suggest a heat blocking member that integrally extends from a reflecting member of a heating unit as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

As mentioned in the previous response, the slats 126 do not extend below a portion of the grill 56 to reflect and to block heat transmitted to an edge of the grill 56. Therefore, slats 126 are not the same as the heat blocking member as recited in claim 1 of the present

The Examiner directs Applicant's attention to US 5,918,536 to Cheng, JP2001-169928, JP06-181849, and JP2000-245624. It is submitted that none of US 5,918,536, JP2001-169928, JP06-181849, and JP2000-245624 teach or suggest "a heat blocking member integrally extending from a reflecting member of the heating unit, to extend below a predetermined portion of the grill unit to reflect and block a part of the thermal energy transmitted to an edge of the grill unit" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

According to the above, none of the cited prior art references teach the features recited in claim 1.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, and 8 (depending, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claim 1. For example, on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that the sump 100 of McLane is the same as the claimed reflecting plate. Nothing in McLane teaches or suggests that the sump 100 is the same as the claimed reflecting plate as recited in claim 3 of the present invention. McLane clearly teaches that the sump 100 is provided to collect grease that drips from foods cooked on the grill 56.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 7, 9-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 AS UNPATENTABLE OVER MCLANE, SR. (US 5,163,359) IN VIEW OF JP 2001-169928 AND JP 2002-355178

The comments in section II above, apply here because McLane does not teach the features recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Similar to claim 1, claim 9 recites, "heat blocking members integrally extending from a reflecting member of the heating units, to extend below a predetermined portion of the grill unit to reflect and to block a part of the thermal energy transmitted to an edge of the grill unit," which distinguishes over McLane.

Therefore, McLane, JP 2001-169928, and JP 2002-355178, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 9 of the present invention.

Dependent claim 7 (depending indirectly from claim 1) and 10-20 (depending either directly or indirectly from claim 9) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1 and 6.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: B-1-05

By: 
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501